

**Meeting Of the
Joint Committee of Infrastructure & Board of Public Works
January 27, 2022 at 5:30 PM
Nashua North High School Board Room
8 Titan Way**

Agenda

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 1. Opening Committee Meeting | Chairman O'Brien |
| - General Introductory Remarks | |
| 2. Public Comment | ----- |
| 3. Approval of Minutes | Chairman O'Brien |
| - Minutes of November 4, 2021 | Review by T. Cummings |
| 4. Amendment of HKT Contract | Review by T. Cummings |
| - \$37,000 Amendment for HKT for misc. costs | |
| 5. Update on Timeline | Review by T. Cummings |
| 6. Review of Awards | Review by T. Cummings |
| - Construction Awards | |
| 7. Old or Miscellaneous Business Items | |
| - Discussion on meeting time and date
(Thursdays at 530 PM ?) | |
| - | |
| 8. Adjourn | |
| Next Meeting: _____? | |

**JOINT MEETING OF
THE COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE BOARD
OF PUBLIC WORKS**

A joint meeting of the Commission on Infrastructure and the Board of Public Works was held on Thursday, November 4, 2021, at 5:00 p.m., in the Auditorium at City Hall, 229 Main Street, Nashua, NH 03060.

I. OPENING COMMITTEE MEETING

Chairman O'Brien declared the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m.

Michael B. O'Brien, Sr., Chair, Board of Aldermen

Good evening, as Chair I am calling the joint committee of meeting to order on November 4, 2021 at 5:07, or to my military friends, 1707. For the record, a joint Committee of Infrastructure and Board of Public Works is being held today, Thursday, November 4, 2021, right after the Special Board of Public Works meeting located in the City Hall Auditorium. Some members or members of the public may be participating via Zoom teleconference. To access Zoom please refer to the Agenda on City's website for the meeting link. Director Cummings, could you please take the roll call.

Tim Cummings, Director, Economic Development

Yes, Mr. Chairman.

II. ROLL CALL

Mayor Donchess:

Here.

Alderman O'Brien:

Yeah.

Alderman Jette:

I'm here.

Commissioner Moriarty:

Here.

Commissioner Teas:

Present.

Commissioner Schoneman:

Here.

Alderman At-Large Wilshire:

Present.

Absent: Commissioner Pappas, Alderwoman Schmidt, Alderman Lopez, Alderman Tencza

Also Present:

Alderman Klee
Alderwoman Lu
Alderman Dowd
Dan Hudson, P.E., City Engineer
Lisa Fauteux, Director, Division of Public Works
Tim Cummings, Director, Economic Development
Andy Patrician, Assistant Director of Public Works
Carolyn O'Connor, Finance and Administration Manager, Division of Public Works (Via Zoom)
Diane Thibodeau, Executive Assistant, Division of Public Works (Via Zoom)
Carl DuBois, VP/Preconstruction Manager, Harvey Construction Corp.
Janet Slemenda, AID, LEED, AP/Principal, HKT Architects, Inc. (Via Zoom)
Richard Parks, Engineer, WVA Engineering

Chairman O'Brien:

I want to get in for the record, as by our procedures when somebody is out, in order to provide a quorum, Alderman At-Large, Lori Wilshire has graciously accepted that role and we welcome herein. Thank you, for the meeting. Thank you Director Cummings you may continue.

Alderman At-Large, Lori Wilshire:

You're welcome. Thank you.

Mr. Cummings:

Thank you. Yes, so then therefore, the minutes will note that President Wilshire will be participating as a voting member of Committee and will help constitute quorum. Next, we have Commissioner Pappas, who I don't believe is with us this evening, and then we have Commissioner Moriarty.

Mr. Cummings:

With seven members present, I believe we have quorum.

Chairman O'Brien:

Very good, thank you. Other elected officials present, I'd like to recognize Alderman Klee and Alderman Lu. Also in attendance is Dan Hudson of the City of Nashua Engineering Department. Also in attendance is Tim Cummings, Development Director, and also acting as the Committee Clerk, and Lisa Fauteux, Director of Public Works and also to recognize Mr. Carl DuBois of Harvey Construction. Please, I didn't write your name down and I missed, Alderman Dowd is also here, thank you, Alderman Dowd. All right, let me just catch up. Okay.

Well I'd like to thank everybody and as you listened to the previous meeting beforehand, we're about ready to get going under this project, Director Cummings will be giving us a lot of information and with Mr. DuBois to be discussed on this project.

Mr. Cummings

If I may?

Chairman O'Brien:

Yeah.

Mr. Cummings:

If I may, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. Just a couple quick comments to orientate this conversation this afternoon. Hopeful today to just go over and the thrust of the meeting is a life cycle analysis, which Carl DuBois of, Harvey Construction is with us to help present today. But then also to just give a general update in terms of where we're at with the project and outline the next steps we'll be taking to maintain the project timeline and schedule, which we're looking to try to get this project under construction in Spring 2022. With that being said, Mr. Chair we may have some people joining us remotely and if that's the case, I just want to make sure they are recognized. I didn't know if anyone has joined us.

Chairman O'Brien:

I haven't.

Mr. Cummings:

I can, do you want to pass that to me and I'll just take a quick –

Chairman O'Brien:

Here you go, super.

Lisa Fauteux, Director, Division of Public Works

I think our finance and administration manager, Carolyn O'Conner is on.

Mr. Cummings:

Okay. And so we do have some participants, Diane okay, Jack, Carolyn,

Ms. Fauteux:

Andy.

Mr. Cummings:

Okay, and then so just so folks know Richard Parks, he's an engineer on the project he's with us as well, if a question arises. Then, Janet Slemenda of HKT Architects is with us as well remotely. I just wanted to confirm that they are participating and they're joining us virtually. With all that being said, Mr. Chair if you wanted to make time for public comment, now would be the time to do so on the agenda, if not, we would move on to approval of the minutes.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman O'Brien:

Before we get into, okay, public comment first? Okay.

Mr. Cummings:

Yes. I'm not sure if anyone wants to make any comments.

Chairman O'Brien:

When you read that was there anybody from the public? At first, we'll go with inside the chamber. Anybody from inside the chamber who would like to give public comment? Seeing none. We will now go to Zoom. Is there anybody on Zoom that would like to give public comment?

Mr. Cummings:

I'm not seeing --

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman O'Brien:

Give it a second. I'm not seeing any hands. Nobody chose to so therefore we'll end the public comment section. Next is a little housekeeping. We did have meetings on May 25, 2021 and August 10, 2021, both have minutes so without objection, I will accept those two meeting minutes and place them on file.

Alderman Jette:

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman O'Brien:

Yes.

Alderman Jette:

I have a correction to the August 10th minutes. On Page 13, I think we were all there in attendance. Halfway down the page, it talks about – it has me – talking about saying "another point" and this was an attempt – in one of my unsuccessful attempts at humor, I said, "I hope no one is armed in this room when I say this, but to Commissioner Schoneman's point, and you're not wearing a piece are you?" That was not directed to Commissioner Schoneman, it was directed to Director Fauteux and it is listed it was Commissioner Schoneman saying no. I don't think she said that. I think it was Director Fauteux who said –

Lisa Fauteux, Director, Division of Public Works:

Yes. You're correct.

Alderman Jette:

And then I went on to -- Commissioner Schoneman had raised the point about was there not another building in the city that could serve this purpose and I said to Commissioner Schoneman's point have we looked at the possibility of using the Elm Street Middle School. The reason I said you're not armed are you, is that I know that Director Fauteux is very anxious about getting this project off the ground and any delay would upset her, and that was my attempt at humor. I would just like the record to show that that was directed to Director Fauteux, not to Commissioner Schoneman.

Ms. Fauteux:

Yup. We will note of that for him.

Chairman O'Brien:

And the Chair agrees, when we compile the new minutes we'll make sure that clarification is --

Alderman Jette:

Okay. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

-- is definitely added. Okay, and Alderman Jette we do appreciate your sense of humor, no problem.

Alderman Jette:

Well, thank you.

Chairman O'Brien:

Okay. All right other than that any objection to accepting both minutes? The minutes are accepted. Moving on to Article 3 on the agenda.

V. CONCURRENCE ON FINANCING PLAN

Mr. Cummings:

Construction manager contract? No, I'm sorry concurrence --

Chairman O'Brien:

Comments on the financial plan.

Mr. Cummings:

Yes. Your packet would have basically a high level memo that outlines a small tweak that came about that I wanted to make sure everyone was aware of. The original discussion we had in August, I had indicated our desire or intent was to transfer from the Broad Street Parkway Fund \$3 million, however, subsequent from that conversation and unbeknownst to me, there's some additional costs that are lingering out there. The thought process would be not to transfer all \$3 million, to transfer \$3 million out the project, leave a million still in the project fund for whatever expenses that may still arise and therefore, we would only transferring \$2 million. I just wanted to be clear on that. I'm asking that this body just concur on the memo that was presented to you.

Chairman O'Brien:

Open up a comment? Okay so without exception, we'll accept the concurrence of the financial plan. Moving on to Number 4 on the agenda, approval of the CM contract. Mr. Cummings.

VI. APPROVAL OF C.M.CONTRACT

Mr. Cummings:

Yes, thank you, thank you Mr. Chair. If I may --

Chairman O'Brien:

Absolutely.

Mr. Cummings:

-- just one second because I just want to make sure I get the number right here. So, Mr. Chair I'm asking for approval this evening of the AIA Document 133-209, a contract for construction management services with Harvey Construction, and I'm asking for it not to exceed a figure of \$12,025,000.00. This is our standard contract that we've used time and time again. It's been reviewed by the legal department and we need to have this body approve it before it gets forwarded onto the full Board of Aldermen for approval. I request that this body help me move the contract along. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien:

Okay. Any comments? Alderman Jette

Alderman Jette:

Just for clarification, this is with Harvey and not the architect?

Mr. Cummings:

This is for construction management services for Harvey.

Alderman Jette:

Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Teas:

Are you looking for a motion sir?

Chairman O'Brien:

Right, and right now it's discussion, well, yeah, I will look for a motion then we'll have the discussion .

Motion by Commissioner Teas: To approve the CM Contract.

Discussion.

Chairman O'Brien:

Thank you, Commissioner Teas. Again, any other discussion on the motion? I do have one question if I may. Just came from a wonderful opening and I give my congratulations to the joint special committee that worked on the Fairground School, and also in attendance was Mr. DuBois. That is beautiful what you have done and I think the best thing that we can do is to value education and I think the new modernization of the facility reflects that, but some words were mentioned. And it's somewhat of a -- you know today in the COVID world and as we get into this, this might be the time to discuss supply issues or anything that I hear in the construction industry. I hate to put Mr. DuBois on the hot seat for this because God only knows, but I think you know what I'm looking at, and if you would like to explain that, please.

1. **Supply Chain Issues**

Carl DuBois, VP/Preconstruction Manager, Harvey Construction Corp.:

Yeah, thank you. The industry right now is in a bit of turmoil as everybody has seen, there's definitely supply chain issues. Been trying to keep the Committee, and in particular, Mr. Cummings and the director informed and the architect informed on what we're seeing for lead time in terms of items. We made a change to the structure of the building in terms of making sure that it was available with the time when we're looking to start in the spring. Steel joists, which are like gauge members that are typically used to support a building for example currently have a 40 week lead time after shop drawing approval. From the time of award it could be up to 50 weeks before it would be delivered, that's a year out. Steel beams on the other hand are pretty much readily available so we made the change early on, a few months ago to make sure that when we start this project in the spring that we have everything that we need. Not only is it supply chain issues, there is also as everybody is seeing, there's some inflationary issues that we're dealing with also. Trying to keep everyone apprised on the team so that we end up making good progress when we need to going forward. It's an ongoing thing. I get notifications pretty much multiples times a week. We just bid a project for example and light fixtures went up 14% from the time we bid it until the time when the order is made. It's crazy right now. Just trying to keep every apprised that it's a crazy market, we're trying to keep our finger on the post so that we can guide our clients moving forward as best we can.

Chairman O'Brien:

I think understanding as somebody as a happy homeowner, my wife and I had to replace a refrigerator and that took several, 8 weeks actually, thank god I have Yeti cooler. If you could keep this Board apprised of any anticipated type of problems. I'll open up to further questions.
Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd:

I would just to concur that we've been experiencing these issues with the school building project and Harvey is way ahead of the stuff. We had to order the steel for the new school a couple weeks ago, first to lock in the price because the price is going up, and also the lead time on roofing material. If we didn't order the roofing material a couple weeks ago, we wouldn't have had it to put it on the roof on the school. We're still waiting for roofing material for Pennichuck, which is just coming in the next couple days. The supply chain is an issue, but as I said Harvey is all over it, staying on top of it.

Mr. Cummings:

Mr. Chair, if I may?

Chairman O'Brien:

Absolutely, Director Cummings.

Mr. Cummings:

Thank you. I know we have a motion on the floor right now so I'm not sure if you want to vote that motion, but I do want to speak to the comments that were just made right now relative to supply chain.

Chairman O'Brien:

Why, what do you feel (inaudible), you can speak.

Mr. Cummings:

Well, if I don't -- it's somewhat of a different ...

Chairman O'Brien:

Oh so, it's a different

Mr. Cummings:

It is, yes.

Chairman O'Brien:

All right, then if you can yield for a few seconds I'll open up for another question on the pending motion. Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

Well to Mr. DuBois, switching from steel joist to steel beams, what's the difference? Is that going to ...

Mr. Dubois:

It's actually a stiffer building. It's actually in my opinion it's going to be a better overall product. Joist are light gauge members, there's less tonnage, you've probably been even in buildings where all of sudden you feel like the floor might be moving if there's enough people walking at the same time. Steels beams 5 feet on center and a good concrete slab on top gives you a very stiff, it's like this building you're not going to feel nothing. So overall it's a better product in the end. Much better product.

Alderman Jette:

Okay. Thank you.

Mr. DuBois:

You're welcome. If I may.

Chairman O'Brien:

Absolutely, please.

Mr. DuBois:

The problem that we're seeing is Amazon for example, I've been told has a \$5 billion with a "B" construction program going on and they have tied up almost 30% of the marketplace just feeding them. As you heard what's going on potentially in Hudson, those size buildings they're all steel trusses and steel joist. It's just been very difficult to get your hands on stuff like that lately. Hence, the reason we talked to the folks and the designers to make an appropriate change.

Alderman Jette:

Okay, thank you.

Mr. DuBois:

You're welcome.

Chairman O'Brien:

I'll open up to any other further questions from members of the joint committee. Seeing none, I'll call for the vote.

MOTION CARRIED: 6-Yea – 1 Nay (Schoneman)

VII. FINANCE COMMITTEE APPROVAL: \$400,000.00 ROOFING MATERIAL

Chairman O'Brien:

At this time I'll yield to Director Cummings.

Mr. Cummings

Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. You hit a very critical issue for us and I appreciate the conversation right now. So there is a particular supply chain issue that I want to make everyone aware of, that I'm struggling with and I'm not sure how best to handle it at this time, and it's relative to roofing. Harvey Construction has made it clear that they really need to be cut loose early to procure the roof for this building. However, we don't have all the funding sources in place yet to actually have a project at hand. We're in a little bit of a catch -22. This is an order of magnitude type of expenditure of between \$300,000.00 and \$500,000.00 type of cost. I think what I would recommend to you, and I wanted to start that conversation now, is that I would be coming back before you in the next or two, or get this body together again and have along the parallel course of the bonding resolution that would be coming through, some sort of authorization so we could move the roofing expenditure in advance of every other material that we would need to purchase because otherwise, it's going to cost us more money in the long run because it will push the timeline and the schedule out. We won't finish the building as we're originally projecting and we would have to carry the building for an additional year with winter conditions and that will only increase costs. I think Carl wanted to speak to it and he could probably do it better than I could.

Mr. DuBois:

If I may be recognized.

Chairman O'Brien:

Yes.

Mr. DuBois:

I will tell you we put the roofing out to bid. We've got three bids. The apparent low bidder I was hoping to hear back from before I sat in this meeting. My thought is they're actually rationing out, suppliers are rationing out insulation to try to keep everybody going at this point in time. If we were to order, for example if we were order this roofing material in November based on a 8 month lead time it would arrive probably in the time that need it. If something was to

happen and this project god forbid was to get cancelled, I don't think the City would have an issue. Trying to hear from the roofer and get it in writing that they'll use that material somewhere else because there's such a shortage. That I did not get today, but I'm still pursuing that. And, there's no expense to the City until they take ownership until it's delivered and that ain't happening until June of next year at this point in time. (inaudible) expense personally.

Mr. Cummings:

So this is --

Mr. DuBois:

You will be under contract, I just want you to understand.

Mr. Cummings:

So these are some of the details that we're working through over the next couple weeks. What I think I would like to recommend is we have some sort of early contract to authorize Harvey to procure the roofing material. I'd be looking to get this body's approval and probably get Finance Committee's approval because that would be a contract, and run that along parallel course with the bonding authorization so we wouldn't have to wait until the bonding was done and we had the full funding available before we started the contracting process or the notice to proceed type process that we would traditionally do. In theory, we wouldn't be issuing a notice to proceed until at the earliest, probably somewhere around mid-December and most likely probably just the first of the year. I'm trying to just get a little bit ahead of that so we can maintain our schedule. I guess more to come on that. I just wanted to make everyone aware of this development. I sent an email or a communication to the Board of Aldermen probably about 4 weeks ago now talking about supply chain issues and construction costs because I anticipated these type of issues coming up and hopefully folks saw that communication that I sent around to the Board of Aldermen. This shouldn't be a surprise.

Chairman O'Brien:

I do have one question if I may not to put you on the spot, but after we sold the Broad Street facility we did have that monies, and there is a time cost theoretically on that. Can that money help us out in this type of situation or we're talking a different animal in case somebody has that question?

Mr. Cummings:

No, no Mr. Chair you're talking about a source of funds that would be one of three or four sources that we're compiling to get to the total project cost. That money, that cash is readily available to us we would just need to have authorization to spend it.

Chairman O'Brien:

Okay. Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd:

Yeah, once the project's legislatively approved, and you have your budget the way the bonds are issued because you're going to have to do Broad Street, ah Broad Street -- Burke Street property first, but the new treasurer will work that out. They handle that and just for people who might not be aware, we don't buy the bonds we start the project. Once the monies start getting spent, then the treasurer issues bonds, so the bonds are issued much later.

Mr. Cummings:

If I may, Mr. Mayor.

Chairman O'Brien:

Oh, absolutely, go ahead.

Mr. Cummings:

Alderman Dowd raises a really good point and actually, it's probably a good time for me to just remind everyone of the various sources of funds we'll be using. In terms of how we get to our \$15.1 million project. I appreciate you bringing this up Alderman Dowd. First and foremost we have general obligation bonds already authorized at \$6 million. There's a general fund cash escrow that has already been authorized at \$500,000.00. Then we would be looking to use the proceeds from the Burke Street sale at \$3.6 million. Repurposing of the Broad Street Parkway of \$2 million. That brings us to a total of about \$12.1 million and what I believe what Alderman Dowd is referencing is the last part of it which is we would be submitting legislation. As you recall, we asked for approval of this at the August meeting for \$2 million we'll be looking for \$3 million to have a total project cost of \$15.1 million, which is what we would be using for this project. Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you, Alderman Dowd.

Chairman O'Brien:

Oh, okay. Now my question, another question to Director Cummings. It seems prudent what you're asking with the roofing materials. What's the best way for this Board to handle it? Just to give you a verbal authorization or would you like a motion and to approve it?

Mr. Cummings:

It wouldn't be just this body, if this body was willing to today to authorize an expenditure for the roofing material, I would then get the paperwork ready and I would submit to the Finance Committee.

Chairman O'Brien:

Okay, then my question would be to, you've done this before and joint special --

Alderman Dowd:

A couple of times.

Chairman O'Brien:

It would probably be best be done with a motion then? With a recommendation to the --

Mr. Cummings:

Typically, you're going to put in a --

Alderman Dowd:

We'll put an RTA in -- Recommendation to Award -- what's being bought, how much it costs and everything and you just need to approve that and as Chair you'll need to sign it and good to go.

Chairman O'Brien:

Okay. So we could just do it verbally and then, or do you want the motion to appear?

Alderman Dowd:

Well it's not my call.

Chairman O'Brien:

No, I'm just looking for direction.

Mr. Cummings:

I'd recommend a motion.

Chairman O'Brien:

A motion?

Mr. Cummings:

-- and it would be a not to exceed --

Chairman O'Brien:

I would think -- that's what I'm trying to look for, the cleanest way to get this done -- exactly--

Mr. Cummings:

-- a motion not to exceed based on a number that Harvey Construction provides.

Chairman O'Brien:

Okay.

Mr. Cummings:

For roofing material.

Chairman O'Brien:

All right. You seem to have an interest with Commissioner Moriarty. Are you willing to make that particular motion?

Commissioner Moriarty:

What, what is that number not to exceed, was it \$300,000.00? Is that what I heard?

Mr. Cummings:

No, I think it's a little more than that.

Mr. DuBois:

Can I make it, I will double-check this, but I believe based on our latest numbers that if you made it not to exceed \$400,000.00, you're going to be fine.

Commissioner Moriarty:

That would be my motion, your honor, to approve Harvey to secure the roofing material not to exceed \$400,000.00?

Alderman Jette:

Mr. Chairman.

Chairman O'Brien:

Yes, I don't know if I've lost track here, but I -- isn't there a ...

Chairman O'Brien:

Yeah, it did move kind of quickly -- I can understand that, yeah.

Alderman Jette:

-- pending motion. Isn't there a pending motion to approve the construction manager's contract?

Mr. Cummings:

-- that just happened --

Ms. Fauteux:

That just, we did --

Chairman O'Brien:

Yeah, we just -- I thought we already voted --

Alderman Jette:

-- we already voted --

Mr. Cummings:

Yes.

Alderman Jette:

Okay, see I told you I was --

Chairman O'Brien:

Nope, no you're doing a fine job. You're doing a fine job. Commissioner Schoneman what I'm going to do is accept a motion and then I'll open the motion up for discussion and then you'll be the first question, by decorum. Okay, if you don't mind, please. All right. So the motion before us is up to \$400,000.00 for the purchase of securing roofing material, we'll work on the language on that, I'll open it up for discussion. I recognize Commissioner Schoneman.

Commissioner Schoneman:

Thank you, Mr. O'Brien. What I understood from the discussion that we just had was that we don't actually pay for these materials until we get them, which is nearly a year out. So why are we securing the financing now?

Chairman O'Brien:

I, I, think Mr. DuBois would like to have backing before he goes out and purchases. This particular Board would authorize that particular cost, and I think best would be referred to Director Cummings --

Mr. Cummings:

-- you've got Alderman Dowd -- yeah, yeah, yeah, please --

Chairman O'Brien:

-- a man who's done this before, that I'm learning correct?

Mr. Cummings:

Just a few times.

Chairman O'Brien:

Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd:

They can't go out and order because now it's on their onus to pay for it ...

Chairman O'Brien:

Right.

Alderman Dowd:

It needs a motion to obligate the City to pay for it, now we can go out --

Chairman O'Brien:

Go out and purchase ...

Alderman Dowd:

-- an exercise the contract and it does take a long time. We just ordered the roofing materials for the new school, which is downstream, but it just takes forever to get the roofing material, and it's good to lock in the price before it goes crazy.

Chairman O'Brien:

Well I think, did you have a follow up Commissioner Schoneman?

Commissioner Schoneman:

So this RTA is going to go to finance, but it won't be approved by the Board until –

Mr. Cummings:

-- finance committee -- It has to go -- from here it would move to Finance Committee and then once it has Finance Committee approval, it would be authorized.

Commissioner Schoneman:

Okay, but the expenditure of the money doesn't come until the product is delivered?

Mr. Cummings:

Right.

Mr. DuBois:

Right.

Commissioner Schoneman:

-- because we're not even sure we can get the materials.

Mr. DuBois:

We can get the materials, it's just got an extended lead time on it right now. So, what I'm saying is by the time it would arrive will be next year. It'll be late spring/early summer of next year.

Alderman Dowd:

You have to get the vendor place –

Mr. Cummings:

-- place the order --

Mr. DuBois:

-- place the order--

Alderman Dowd:

-- or to take the order and put it in --

Mr. DuBois:

-- Queue --

Alderman Dowd:

-- their pipeline—

Commissioner Schoneman:

Okay.

Mr. DuBois:

However, I do, if I may be recognized.

Chairman O'Brien:

Yes, sorry, Mr. DuBois.

Mr. DuBois:

I do have to issue a subcontract agreement to a subcontractor to purchase that. I'm looking for an obligation from the City, an authorization to say yes, we will back the contract so that you can place the order. There will be no expenditure until next year, just so you understand.

Commissioner Schoneman:

I see.

Mr. DuBois:

You're welcome.

Commissioner Schoneman:

Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien:

Further comments from anybody from the joint committee? Seeing none. I'll call for a vote on the pending motion.

MOTION CARRIED: 6 Yea – 1 Nay (Schoneman)

Chairman O'Brien:

Just to make sure we're up to speed and concur with Alderman Jette, we did take care of item number four, the contract for construction manager, and we did also do the roof, so now we're moving on to number 5, architectural amendments.

VIII. ARCHITECTURAL AMENDMENT(S)

Chairman O'Brien:

There is a communication, but I'm going to lead with Director Cummings.

Tim Cummings, Director, Economic Development:

Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. There's an amendment to the architecture's contract for just over \$40,000.00. We needed to submit an AOT application to the State, that's a permit that wasn't originally anticipated when we started the project. As we continued along with design, we needed to initiate that AOT expenditure. That is something that the civil engineer does on behalf of the architect who is a sub to our architect, HKT, and in addition to that, there was some additional design work that needs to be done as Carl alluded to a few moments ago about looking at designing the building differently and incorporating some differing type of material, which is what we believe we're going to be doing as we continue the design. We needed to have an additional structural review done. Looking to get approval by this body and then to move it onto the Finance Committee for \$40,060.00 --

Chairman O'Brien:

-- \$40,060.00. Okay I'll be looking to open it up for discussion. We'll ask for a motion.

Mr. Cumming:

Yeah, he just made the motion.

Chairman O'Brien:

You just made the motion? Mr. Teas.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER TEAS: To approve architectural amendment.

Commissioner Teas:

I did.

Chairman O'Brien:

I just wanted to make sure, sorry. Okay. we have a motion to approve the architectural amendments for a total of \$40,060.00 and to submit the amendments to the Finance Committee. I will now open it up for discussion.

Discussion.

Any comments from members of the joint committee? Seeing none. I will move to question.

MOTION CARRIED: 6 Yea – 1 Nay (Schoneman)

IX. LIFE CYCLE COST PRESENTATION

Chairman O'Brien:

Next on the agenda is Life Cycle Cost presentation. I think now we're going to get away from Director Cummings and I think we're going to look to you, Mr. DuBois, please.

Carl DuBois, VP/Preconstruction Manager, Harvey Construction Corp.

Thank you. I'm going to try to do this some justice. This is not my report. This is Mr. Park's and I think he's online on the phone. Richard, if I trip up, you can jump in here and help me.

Richard Parks, WVA Engineering:

Okay.

Mr. DuBois:

This is a study that they put together, I believe it's in your package.

Alderman Jette:

If he's on the Zoom would it be better for him to do it?

Mr. DuBois:

I'd be thrilled.

Mr. Parks:

Yeah I can do that. All right. Can you guys hear me okay?

Mr. DuBois:

Yup.

Mr. Parks:

Oh, beautiful. Basically we were asked to put together this life cycle cost estimate based off of where we at in the project. Some information we had gotten from the City on utility rates as well as estimating service costs and replacement costs of equipment as it failed. Taking all that information and putting it together we built an energy model for the building, again where it was at 50% CE stage, again using utility rates based off of the systems that we have and are 50% drawings estimating annual operations costs and you can see those figures there. I tried to keep the tables pretty simple. I spoke with some contractors that do service and reviewed some (inaudible) RS means numbers. We came up an estimated annual PM cost based off of these systems again (inaudible) 50%. Put together an estimate of a dollar figure for every (inaudible) and every 4 years basically. Some additional monies to be put aside to replacement equipment as it failed, larger piece of equipment not a whole sale replacement. Again, the residual value I included that and I listed that figure as zero. Again, thinking that this building was going to be maintained by the City afterwards (inaudible) going to have zero value, but you're going to try and sell it to get something back (inaudible). All that being said, Carl and the team at Harvey helped us out with the initial building cost, the initial project cost that's where we got the \$11 million from. We ran these --

Mr. Cummings:

If I may--

Mr. Parks:

Yup.

Mr. Cummings:

Thanks, sorry, we don't have what you're looking at so, could you share your screen?

Mr. Parks:

Sure.

Mr. Cummings:

Thank you.

Mr. Parks:

Sorry about that. Probably pretty confusing if you can't see it. Let me try and figure this out.

Mr. Cummings:

Let me see if I can give you permission to share screen.

Jeff Poehnert, CTV

You're all set, you can share.

Mr. Cummings:

Thanks, Jeff.

Mr. Poehnert:

Yup.

Mr. Parks:

Can you guys see? Can you see my letter here?

Mr. Cummings:

Yes.

Mr. Parks:

All right. Good now I don't have to look at the screen -- I'm sorry -- Okay. So a lot of what I talked about here were the dollar values that you can see now. Using an evaluation period of 20 years at an interest rate of 2.5%. Using a construction cost of approximately \$11 million, as well as average annual operating costs, not only for electricity, but for natural gas and mechanical PM or preventative maintenance, mechanical equipment replacement costs. Again, over that 4 year period. And there's the residual value after than 20 year period. Gross square footage of the project 25,760 square feet. Initial cost by the gross square footage gave us \$427.02. The operational cost is \$3.22 a square foot. Then using all these figures above the estimated life cycle cost is roughly \$793,596.00 per year. This is for scenario one, which is a 20 year period at 2.5% interest. Turn to the next page here.

You can see scenario two. Can everyone read this, still? So really the only difference between scenario one and scenario two is the interest rate. Still the same evaluation period, still the same buildings, still the costs. You can see that really it's the effect on the interest rate bumps up the life cycle cost for \$810,367.00 per year. At the bottom here is kind of a summary that I have already said for what the different values mean in the tables above.

Chairman O'Brien:

Mr. DuBois.

Mr. DuBois:

I think what's interesting in the study, granted its only over a term of 20 years, this building is going to last a lot longer than that, but what I think what I came away with from an operational standpoint would be what would be the cost to operate the building from a utilities standpoint on an annual basis?

Chairman O'Brien:

Mr. DuBois I'm sure there's no problem, but where this was presented via Zoom, could we receive two copies of the presentation by Mr. Parks? One to Ms. Thibodeau and our clerk to Donna Graham, so that we can put them into the record, please.

Mr. DuBois:

Absolutely.

Chairman O'Brien:

Thank you. Alderman Jette.

Mr. Cummings:

I'll get them to you.

Discussion.

Alderman Jette:

At the last meeting, there was a discussion about why were we using natural gas when the City has said that it's going to try to get away from fossil fuels as much as possible and with the news that were getting constantly about the climate crisis, I know that during the last meeting there was a discussion about that and the architect, Ms. Slemenda said that she would go and look at what the alternatives might be and what those costs might be so that we could make an intelligent decision about are we willing to look at alternative sources of energy. Maybe geothermal or maybe solar or whatever. You remember the discussion?

Mr. DuBois:

I remember the discussion. It did not go unheard. To be honest with you we're in the process of looking and evaluating costs to bring water lines from this building back for the generator building. Is that what we called that on the landfill?

Lisa Fauteux, Director, Division of Public Works

Yeah. The Co-gen plant.

Mr. Dubois:

Because you have free methane with all the trash you can burn to make hot water and feed this building. So it's primarily free energy because of the methane in the landfill. So we are looking at that right now. So these numbers would all change based on utility usage in the course of a year if you're pretty much getting free gas all year long.

Alderman Jette:

Okay, so this life cycle cost presentation is not, was not meant to address those issues that were raised --

Mr. DuBois:

That's correct.

Alderman Jette:

-- at the last meeting.

Mr. DuBois:

No, this addressed the design as it is today. Prior to the discussion about looking at alternatives and one of the alternatives thinking outside of the box was, we got all this methane gas and we're burning it anyways, why don't we heat the hot water and bring it underground to the building? And you would not be burning any additional fossil fuel other than what's coming out of the ground that has to be spent anyways. So, that in the process so I suspect that these life cycle costs that's in front of you is going to change dramatically on an annual utility usage basis. We're evaluating the cost now in terms of bringing the lines to the building and what that would take.

Alderman Jette:

Okay. So may I follow up?

Chairman O'Brien:

Follow up, yes.

Alderman Jette:

So when the discussion, or the decision about how we're going to heat and cool this building? When is that going to be made? My understanding that we were going to revisit that decision to use natural gas based upon what Ms. Slemenda was going to look into. Am I correct? Am I not correct in that?

Mr. DuBois:

Jen is on the line. She can answer. I think through the discussion purposes --

Mr. Cummings:

May I?

Mr. DuBois:

Jim if you want to fill in --

Mr. Cummings:

We can have that conversation Alderman Jette and happy to have that conversation. We're not prepared yet totally to have the conversation because we're still doing our due diligence, getting the facts together, being able to present numbers to you, but the fact of the matter is, it's going to be very costly. It's going to be very costly to do this upfront. As someone who's charged with trying to put the project together in terms of its capital stack, and the sources, there's going to need to be an admission by the City to increase the total project budget, which if that's what folks want to do here, happy to do that. That would be the type of conversation and when we get those details we can present them to you, but you're talking order of magnitude of like \$1 million. It will be in that, and we need to be comfortable with that. I'm not prepared yet to have that detailed conversation, but it would be coming in short order. I'm trying to just maintain the project schedule right now knowing that we will add in that additional variable once we get the details.

Alderman Jette:

Okay, thank you.

Chairman O'Brien:

Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd:

We evaluated geothermal for the new school and the upfront cost on geothermal is huge. Your payback gets driven way out and you end up escalating the cost of the project upfront, which is

nothing we want to do right now. That's an issue. As far as the solar, the solar I believe we're designing this for solar panels on the roof, even though you got plenty of land out there to do solar panels --

Dr. DuBois:

--exactly--

Alderman Dowd:

ground as well. That will power the building and even have excess to go out to the grid. I'm scheduled to have a meeting with Senator Avard and he's trying to expand the net metering to allow the City to gain more cost savings in driving all of our buildings. We're installing solar on all the roofs, Fairgrounds for anybody that was there today. The whole roof is covered with solar. It drives the energy cost to the school and at times feeds energy out to the grid. There's no cost whatsoever for the City it's public private partnership. We don't have to pay for the solar panels on the roofs and we enjoy the power to run the buildings and there's not enough to generate heat to the building. You're not going to use solar to generate heat.

Chairman O'Brien:

-- Director Cummings --

Mr. Cummings:

Thank you and I appreciate Alderman Dowd's comments and I think we should be focusing on that when we do the garage. And so when we get the garage and we have that 150,000 square foot building that's where the solar panel will make the most impact and I would be looking for us to make sure it was included when we do that project. I know we're going to do it sometime in short order Director Fauteux.

Lisa Fauteux, Director, Division of Public Works

-- sorry about that--

Mr. Cummings:

I know, I know.

Alderman Jette:

Mr. Chair?

Chairman O'Brien:

Yes, Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

I just want to make the comment that I'm not telling you anything that is not known by all of you. We are in a crisis. We are in a climate crisis. We cannot, you know and to deal with that problem we all have to do what we can to get away from fossil fuels. I know that it costs more, but we can't be just looking at the dollar costs today. We have to think about what are the costs to the environment? What are the costs? I know Commissioner Schoneman has made the point about how expensive this project is and how we're passing that onto our children. Well, and we should think about what else we're passing on to our children. Are we going to pass onto them a planet that is unlivable? I don't mean to be an alarmist, but the alarm bells are ringing. If you read the newspaper, if you watch the news. You have to be aware of what is happening. I think we cannot keep. I understand we all want to, we all have a fiduciary obligation to the taxpayers about spending their money, but we also have an obligation to them to preserve their environment. So I encourage us to get the information and then once we have the information, we can make a decision about whether we can do this project in a better way or not. I would encourage us not to be solely concerned about what is this going to cost in dollars and cents now. We should be concerned about what is it going to cost from a larger point of view? I'm looking forward to hearing that information and let's reserve the decision until we get the information. Thank you. Thank you for indulging me.

Chairman O'Brien:

Thank you Alderman Jette. Okay,

Ms. Fauteux:

I just--

-- I just--

Chairman O'Brien:

Yes, Director Fauteux.

Ms. Fauteux:

I just want to clarify – the power and the heat would not come from the actual methane. It would actually come from the generators, the heat from the generators that produce the power. I just wanted to clarify that. That it's actually from the generator. We are researching that and we'll definitely have a price on a gennie and present it to this group and the decision can be made as whether we proceed. But we are working on that.

Alderman Jette:

Okay. And if I could just ...

Chairman O'Brien:

Absolutely, Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

Thank you for your indulgence Mr. Chairman. I just saw a presentation about this and the person who was speaking was talking about how alternative forms of energy like wind and solar and he talked about solar. The cost of solar continues to go down. The cost of constructing the materials that these solar panels is constantly going down and it's soon to go below the cost of natural gas. In the future, according to this person, the future is in electricity generated by solar. We've got a large space there at the landfill, you know, solar panels not just on the roof, but there's a lot of land there where solar panel could be installed. And I'll jump off my soapbox there. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien:

We appreciate your advocacy. Alderman Lu, you will have to come up to a mic.

Alderwoman Lu:

Thank you. I just had a couple questions about the life cycle analysis. There are two versions, or did you say the only difference is the interest rate?

Mr. Cummings:

Yes.

Mr. DuBois:

That's what was reported. Yes.

Alderwoman Lu:

Okay. Is that the interest rate of borrowing costs? Is that the cost to borrow?

Mr. Cummings:

I can answer that. That was what was recommended to us by the treasurer in the Treasurers Department.

Alderwoman Lu:

Sure, well I don't mean is that accurate. I meant is that an interest rate that we would –

Mr. Cummings:

I think -- do better. We'll do better, but we're being conservative. I don't what we'll get, but somewhere between 2 and 2.5%.

Alderwoman Lu:

I'm sorry. What I wanted to ask is, is that the interest, a theoretical interest rate on borrowing? On the fund borrowed for the project?

Mr. Cummings:

Again, it is a conservative projection that we were recommended to use for the modeling. We expect we will do better. Somewhere between 2 and 2.5%.

Alderwoman Lu:

I think you're saying yes, but it sounds like you don't the gist of my question. My question isn't whether it's accurate, but whether this interest rate are you talking about the interest rate paid on our borrowed funds?

Mr. DuBois:

Yes.

Mr. Cummings:

Yes, yes.

Alderwoman Lu:

Thank you, thank you. It had no question about, I knew it was theoretical. So this life cycle analysis isn't really a comparison of two different ways of --because I saw -- it seems that this process is typically done to analyze a couple of different ways of green approaches to building is what I have seen it used for. You know you want a green building. You know it's going to cost you more upfront. I had expected that when you were pulling out the life cycle analysis we would be looking at a couple of versions of how we decide to power this project. Not necessarily the difference in an interest rate on borrowing funds.

Mr. DuBois:

Mr. Parks can answer that, or I'll take a swing at it. Currently, based on the design of what we have that's what he based it on. As I said to Mr. Jette, I think this is going change if we decide to move forward, for example with the hot water coming from the generators in lieu of using fossil fuel to burn within the building. That would be here's your fossil fuel, here's your boilers in the building. If we get it from the generators that would be your life cycle cost. That would be comparing one system to another. That would be forthcoming and the same with solar. I mean we'd have to talk to Revision Energy. On this building, I could tell you it's not a very big roof. The square footage is only 12,500, less the elevator protrusion, less the roof top units. We're waiting to hear back to see if that would even be viable for them based on that amount of square footage. To Alderman Jette's point, there's a lot of land out there and that's something else that could be looked at. (Inaudible) land that capped but whether it's viable to put solar panels on that, that would have to be asked but it can be looked at. So then you would be looking at based on ultimately what could be designed today, if you're looking at just the building, what the cost of the system would be versus just buying everything off the grid. So this is one pass and many of them could be forthcoming depending on the systems that are being proposed.

Alderwoman Lu:

Okay. As an analysis, it's an analysis of two different interest rates, correct?

Mr. DuBois:

Currently, right now yes.

Alderwoman Lu:

Okay, and has the committee had a chance to hear from our energy specialist about Alderman Jette's questions about different -- I don't know whether -- I don't what solar or heat pump the relative costs or efficiencies, or environmental benefit of each. Is there someone that we would ask?

Ms. Fauteux:

Yup. Victoria Brown who is our energy manager who is involved in all of these discussions.

Alderwoman Lu:

Okay, great. I know that the question has been asked several times and I heard Director Cummings say that it would be an awful lot, but it seems like what we really need to know is how much would it be? Rather than just discard it, and I just want to say that I agree with Alderman Jette in the sense that even our pension, our New Hampshire pension is becoming such a problem because of the general -- one thing, I mean definitely the state we don't like what they did but the idea that we can't pass on to other generations costs and the environment is one of

these costs. So, I think that's a very important consideration to actually value and quantify. Thank you.

X. FINAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman O'Brien:

Thank you, Alderman Lu. Right now we'll open it up for the final public comment. Anybody in the chamber who would like to come up. Seeing no body from the public. Director Cummings, can you check online? Just to see if we have any Zoom hands raised.

Mr. Cummings:

Yup, we got Mr. Shea here.

Chairman O'Brien:

Okay. Mr. Shea, I will recognize you for public comment.

Mr. Shea:

Thank you, Alderman O'Brien. I just wanted to hop on this evening and join for the meeting and listen in. I don't have too much to say other than I do appreciate Alderwoman Lu and Alderman Jette's comments and questions regarding quantifying cost for green energy solutions for the project, and I'll be interested to see how those numbers come together as well. I hope you're all having a great evening and thank you for your time.

Chairman O'Brien:

Thank you, Mr. Shea. Now I'll be looking for any type of general comments or remarks by members of the joint committee. Seeing none so everybody can anticipate what's going on here. As you know one big timelines it looks like hopefully, we'll get this thing going by spring of 2022. This is why we'll be the hard work and there will be an additional meeting that will be coming up. Right now taking the holidays and everything in mind, anticipate somewhere, I think we'll work with Director Fauteux and Director Cummings on the exact date. It will be determined, but it's going to be in early December. So if you can kind of keep that in mind we'll be working on that and we'll meet together as a joint committee. Saying that, a motion to adjourn is always in order. Can I have a motion? Mr. Mayor.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion By Mayor Donchess: To adjourn.

MOTION CARRIED: Unanimously.

The special meeting of the Committee on Infrastructure and Board of Public Works was adjourned 6:08 p.m.

DRAFT



wv engineering associates, pa.
 11 King Court, Keene, New Hampshire 03431

www.wvengineering.com
 t: 603.352.7007

November 2, 2021

Ms. Janet Slemenda
 HKT Architects Inc.
 24 Roland Street, Suite 301
 Charlestown, MA 02129

Re: **City of Nashua**
Department of Public Works
141 - 143 Burke Street
Nashua, New Hampshire
WVA Project No. 19218

Dear Janet:

Using the information derived from the 50% construction energy model, construction cost estimates, preventative maintenance (PM) and replacement estimate, we offer the following life cycle cost (LCC) estimates:

Scenario #1		
Evaluation Period	20	Year
Interest	2.5%	
Initial Building Cost	\$11,000,000	Total
Estimated Annual Operational Energy Cost	\$46,390	kWh
	\$11,588	Therm
Mechanical PM	\$25,000	Year
Replacement Cost	\$20,000	4 Years
Residual Value	\$0	
GSF of Project	25,760	Sq. Ft.
Initial Cost/GSF	\$427.02	
Operational/GSF	\$3.22	
Estimated LCC	\$793,596.42	Year

Scenario #2		
Evaluation Period	20	Year
Interest	2.75%	
Initial Building Cost	\$11,000,000	Total
Estimated Annual Operational Energy Cost	\$46,390	kWh
	\$11,588	Therm
Mechanical PM	\$25,000	Year
Replacement Cost	\$20,000	4 Years
Residual Value	\$0	
GSF of Project	25,760	Sq. Ft.
Initial Cost/GSF	\$427.02	
Operational/GSF	\$3.22	
Estimated LCC	\$810,367.04	Year

Utility rates used for the energy model are \$9.00/MMBTU natural gas and \$0.15/kWhr provided by Lisa Fauteux and Doris Brown. The PM cost value is for water treatment, filter replacement, controls adjustment, cooling tower cleaning, equipment service, and grease duct cleaning. The replacement cost value is for replacement of HVAC parts and pieces every four years. The replacement cost is not intended to represent major equipment replacement as we anticipate major equipment will last longer than 20 years with proper care and PM. Given this is a municipal building with continued use after loan repayment we did not include residual value calculation in the LCC estimates.

Sincerely,

WV Engineering Associates, PA



Richard A. Parks, III, PE



TO: Jim Donchess, Mayor & Michael O'Brien, Chair
FROM: Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director
Date: January 24, 2022
RE: Approval of HKT Contract Amendment for AoT Design Services & Structural Design Modifications

The enclosed documents requesting an increase in the HKT design contract by \$37,000.00 for miscellaneous costs and for some unforeseen additional work that was not part of the original scope of work, but necessary in order to complete the design and keep the project schedule on track.

As the design team moves into their final phase of their design contract a reconciliation occurred, which showed that additional funds were expended on some matter due to the unforeseen issues/conditions. For instance, the building was shifted to create a better buffer. Another example is a request by the state permitting agency to redo a drainage design. To maintain the overall project timeline it was recommended to use funds currently set aside in the contract for "construction administration" phase and backfill once the amendment is approved. Without some of these design changes such as making the changes at the state agencies request the project cannot proceed.

THANK YOU.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT

This Second Amendment to Agreement is entered into as of this _____ day of February 2022, by and between CITY OF NASHUA, a municipality in the State of New Hampshire (hereinafter referred to as "City"), and HKT Architects, INC., (hereinafter referred to as the "Architect") whose address is 24 Roland Street, Charleston, MA 02129.

WHEREAS, City and Architect entered into that certain Professional Architectural Services related to the Design and Construction Oversight for Division of Public Works Facility for the Nashua Department of Public Works, dated March 6, 2020 by HKT and March 11, 2020 by the City of Nashua (the " Agreement"); and

WHEREAS, both City and Architect desire to amend the Agreement to expand the scope of services and amend the budget.

NOW THEREFORE, the parties agree as follows:

- I. Pursuant to Section 30 of the Agreement "Modification of Contract and Entire Agreement, " the Agreement is hereby amended to add the additional scope and amended budget as described in the January 21, 2022 letter to Director Lisa Fauteux relative to the Contract Amendment Proposal which is attached hereto and incorporated fully herein.

2. All other terms of the Agreement remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed, or have caused their properly authorized representatives to duly execute, this First Amendment to Agreement on the date and year first above written.

City of Nashua

HKT Architects, Inc.

By: James Donchess, Mayor

By: Janet M. Slemenda, Principal

Date: _____

Date: _____



William R. Hammer AIA, LEED-AP
Janet M. Siemenda AIA, LEED-AP
Amy J. Dunlap LEED-AP BD+C

January 21, 2022

Lisa Fauteux
Director of Public Works
City of Nashua
9 Riverside Street
Nashua, New Hampshire 03062

Re: Nashua Public Works Project: New Building
Extra Services Request

Dear Lisa,

This letter provides detailed information on the request for an Amendment to the contract for Civil Redesign and Miscellaneous Out of Scope Work for the Nashua Department of Public Works Administration Building Nashua, NH by Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc. HKT has reviewed the individual items and their associated costs and finds them reasonable and supports this request. In the interest of keeping the project moving, Hoyle Tanner did act professionally and continued their work efforts. Please review these and note not just their descriptions but their assumptions going forward.

Tanner & Associates, Inc. (Hoyle Tanner) offers the following descriptions and details with a breakdown in costs:

This fee amendment is for additional engineering services required in connection with the City of Nashua Department of Public Works (DPW). The site plan and permitting revisions are for the 25,000 square foot administrative building for the DPW, located at the site of the Nashua Solid Waste Department at 848 West Hollis Street. Hoyle Tanner has already completed many out of scope tasks for this project. We have worked diligently to revise the Civil Design in order to adhere to all of the schedules required by the City and to ensure that the project's process is moving forward. The City has directed us to address City comments pertaining to the conditional Planning Board Approval as well as the permitting and drainage/site redesign of Infiltration Basin #2 which DES and the City has noted is upgradient in a groundwater flow position of monitoring wells M-11 R/M/S and would significantly interfere with on-going groundwater monitoring.

The below list outlines out of scope tasks completed by Hoyle Tanner as well as additional tasks that have yet to be completed.

Task 1– Miscellaneous Out of Scope Work (Completed to date)

A. Existing Conditions Compilation: \$3,000

- a. Hoyle Tanner was not provided with a completed existing conditions plan that was drafted and annotated with reference plans, datum, legend, notes, etc. We received three (3) different

CAD .dwg files of the existing landfill site from the City for use as a base plan (LANDFILL PROPOSED BUILDING.DWG, FUTUREPW_BUILDINGSURVEYLIMITS01132020.DWG and 20190322-LANDFILL OFFICE PROPOSAL-REV1.DWG). These .dwg files were worksheets and not an existing conditions survey required for design. We spent considerable time compiling these files to the best of our ability and used the LIDAR contour in the lower western portion of site. Wetlands delineation was also needed and performed by Hoyle Tanner.

B. SD Plan Set 30% for Harvey: \$3,000

- a. The Schematic design set was developed and advanced beyond the anticipated 30% Schematic Design and the site was graded for Harvey Construction to be able to accurately calculate cut and fill volumes to further define their cost estimate for the City.

C. Shift Building and Roadway alignment: \$13,000

- a. The building and driveway access was shifted to the east at the direction of the City to provide a more mature existing tree buffer to some of the direct abutters. This shift required the site and driveway access to be redesigned including re-grading of the proposed finished grade, utilities, and stormwater drainage.
- b. Hoyle Tanner provided initial relocated building points to the City for them to layout the proposed building location.

D. Full Planning Board Submission versus Courtesy Presentation: \$5,500

- a. Typical of Municipal projects, Hoyle Tanner had assumed that a courtesy presentation would be made to the Planning Board to provide an overview of the project and a full Site Plan application was not required for the City's own project. We became aware after Schematic Design that the City is required to go through the full Site Plan process in accordance with their Land Use Regulations. Additional services provided and prepared:
 - i. Complete Site Plan Application and filing
 - ii. Plan revisions
 - iii. Preparation of an extensive abutters list
 - iv. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application
 - v. Formal Waivers list for numerous waivers
 - vi. Lot Merger Application and packaging
 - vii. Coordination with Pennichuck Water Works related to "ability to serve" requirements
 - viii. Expenses related to print multiple sets of large format drawings and the site plan review application package."

Task 2 – Drainage Redesign (To be completed)

A. Site Redesign: \$7,000

- a. Hoyle Tanner has been in discussion with the City and Sanborn Head to address concerns brought up by NHDES in relation to the location of Infiltration Basin #2 and the existing required permitting/monitoring program for the landfill. There were different

options discussed, and the City has decided that it is in their best interest to remove a large portion of the parking lot that they had previously requested and remove the Infiltration Basin #2. Significant redesign is required to prepare the site and the final site plans that were approved by the Planning Board on November 4th.

B. Alteration of Terrain (AoT) Submission Package Revisions: \$6,000

- a. The previously submitted AoT application will be revised, coordinated, and updated to the new Site Plan and resubmitted to NHDES. All Best Management Practice (BMP) worksheets, drainage calculations, and Pre/Post Development watershed maps will be revised, as necessary.

The total for these described services is for a lump sum amount of Thirty-Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$37,500) including reimbursable expenses.

Hoyle and Tanner also makes the following Assumptions:

All Assumptions as in the original agreement and as follows:

- City will provide any additional existing conditions data, if required
- City to pay all permit application fees
- There will be no additional presentations or submission to the Planning Board.

Schedule:

Hoyle & Tanner notes that most of these services have been completed to date.

As noted in the original fee proposal, any work that is beyond the scope of work shall be billed as additional services either on a time and material basis or we will make an additional proposal with a lump sum fee or not to exceed fee. In no case will we commence any additional services without your written approval.

If there are additional services that are required by Hoyle Tanner, we will invoice their costs plus a mark-up of 10%. We will invoice you monthly and we will bill as a percentage of the completed work. Payment is due in thirty (30) days of the invoice date.

Hourly rates for HKT shall be as follows:

Principal	\$245/Hour
Associate	\$220/Hour
Project Manager	\$190/Hour
Project Architect	\$190/Hour
Senior Designer	\$165/Hour
Designer	\$145/Hour
Clerical/Office	\$120/Hour
Construction Administrator	\$190/Hour

Hourly Rates for Hoyle, Tanner and Associates are as follows:

Principal Engineer	\$195/Hour
Senior Project Engineer	\$195/Hour
Project Manager III	\$185/Hour
Project Manager II	\$170/Hour

Project Manager I	\$159/Hour
Senior Engineer III	\$150/Hour
Senior Engineer II	\$137/Hour
Senior Engineer I	\$129/Hour
Engineer III	\$116/Hour
Engineer II	\$109/Hour
Engineer I	\$ 92/Hour
Senior Resident Engineer	\$140/Hour
Resident Engineer III	\$122/Hour
Resident Engineer II	\$108/Hour
Resident Engineer I	\$ 80/Hour
Environmental Coordinator III	\$142/Hour
Environmental Coordinator II	\$122/Hour
Environmental Coordinator I	\$ 95/Hour
Senior CADD Technician	\$135/Hour
CADD Technician III	\$113/Hour
CADD Technician II	\$100/Hour
CADD Technician I	\$ 86/Hour
Technician I	\$ 56/Hour
Technician II	\$ 70/Hour
Senior Administrative Prof.	\$185/Hour
Project Assistant II	\$110/Hour
Project Assistant I	\$ 80/Hour
Land Acquisition Specialist II	\$100/Hour
Land Acquisition Specialist I	\$ 82/Hour
Planner II	\$165/Hour
Planner I	\$145/Hour

Very truly yours,
HKT Architects Inc.



Janet M. Slemenda, AIA, LEED-AP, Principal



TO: Michael O'Brien, Chair
FROM: Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director
Date: January 24, 2022
RE: Major Milestone To Be Aware of As We Move Forward

The GMP Amendment was signed in January for **\$10,507,719**. This major milestone will now allow us to advance the project to the next stage.

This next major milestone is to mobilize, which is slated for mid-March. Mobilizing is dependent upon approval of the Alteration of Terrain (AOT) Permit, which is then used to finalize and submit plans for review and approval on protecting the land. This will take several weeks after the AOT is approved. In addition, we will also need to have submitted for our Building Permit application for review and approval along with the Architect doing a final review.

In tandem with the above work there will be some site preparation work performed by the city, which is essentially the relocation of concrete rubble and debris. This work should be happen in early March meeting our articulated goal of a mid-March mobilization.

Once mobilization occurs, the following is a list of general milestones for consideration:

General Milestones for the project:

- Mobilization – Late Qtr. 1 or Early Qtr. 2 (March/April)
- Foundations Complete – Qtr. 2
- Steel Erection Complete – Qtr. 3 or Qtr. 4 (Late Summer / Early Fall)
- Roof Complete – Qtr. 3 or Qtr. 4 (Late Summer / Early Fall)
- Building Weather Tight – Qtr. 3 or Qtr. 4 (Late Summer / Early Fall)
- MEP Complete – Qtr. 4
- Interior Finishes Complete (Substantial Completion) – Qtr. 1 of 2023

- Final Completion – Qtr. 1 or Early Qtr. 2 (of 2023)

THANK YOU.



Buyout Summary Update - Nashua DPW

Project:	Nashua DPW	Job Number:	2021-031
Bid Date:	-	Budget \$	8,427,784
Updated:	1/24/2022	Actuals \$	5,198,227
Buyout { (Save) / Over }:			\$ (3,229,557)

BASE BID Scope of Work Items		Trade/Sub	Awarded	Draft GMP Estimate Dated 01.14.22	Actuals
Div	Discipline				
03	Concrete Material			\$ 92,925	
03	Concrete Reinforcement Material			\$ 46,779	
03	Concrete Footing Sub			\$ 68,510	
03	Concrete Flatwork Sub			\$ 91,950	
04	Masonry			\$ 478,369	
05	Structural Steel, Metal Fabrications	SL Chasse		\$ 942,000	\$ 942,000
05	Column Covers and Canopies			\$ 61,380	
06	Architectural Millwork			\$ 80,919	
07	Waterproofing Damproofing Caulking			\$ 169,600	
07	Roofing	Academy		\$ 261,900	\$ 223,100
07	Fireproofing			\$ 58,988	
08	Doors, Frames, Hardware			\$ 168,810	
08	Overhead Coiling Doors			\$ 6,890	
08	Alum Storefronts, Alum Windows, Glazing			\$ 596,200	
09	Drywall, Cold Metal Framing, Blocking			\$ 749,675	
09	Acoustical Ceiling Tile			\$ 158,000	
09	Floor and Tile			\$ 313,424	
09	Painting and Coating			\$ 41,800	
10	Signs			\$ 18,659	
10	Toilet Compartments, Toilet accessories, Misc Specialties			\$ 13,525	
10	Fire Protection Specialties			\$ 3,223	
10	Folding Panel Partitions			\$ 59,000	
10	Wall and Corner Guards			\$ 5,118	
10	Lockers			\$ 63,222	
12	Window Shades			\$ 26,920	
14	Elevator			\$ 110,800	
22/23	Plumbing, HVAC	JL Hall		\$ 1,841,371	\$ 1,790,867
21	Fire Suppression			\$ 73,600	\$ 663,000
26	Electrical, Fire Alarm	Stellos		\$ 670,356	\$ 663,000
31	Sitework	Jennings		\$ 969,280	\$ 916,260
32	Fencing and Gates			\$ 49,750	
32	Landscaping			\$ 134,841	